

The *Romulea* in Vollmer's *MGH* edition (AA 14) is a collection of ten separate poems on mythological themes. The collective name is derived from a reference to fragments of these poems contained in the *Florilegium Veronense* (Biblioteca Capitolare CLXVIII [155]). The ten poems are extant together only in this one MS; it is not generally held that Dracontius himself considered the poems as a unit.

BEDE'S metrical *VITA CUTHBERTI* (57) echoes *Romulea* VIII.401. The *CCSL* edition of ALDHELM'S *ENIGMATA* cites echoes of *Romulea* VII.154 in four places: XVI.2-3, XXVI.2, XLII.3, and XLVIII.6

Orestis tragoedia [DRACONT.Orest.Trag.]: *CPL* 1514.

MSS—*Refs* none.

The *Orestis tragoedia* is a series of short epic pieces, totalling 974 hexameters, on the theme of Orestes' revenge against Clytemnestra for the murder of Agamemnon.

BEDE'S metrical *VITA CUTHBERTI* (302, and 584) echoes *Orestis tragoedia* (639, and 158).

Daniel Nodds

GRAMMARIANS

[This generic entry provides a general introduction to grammatical writings in Anglo-Saxon England, and in the final version will include entries on anonymous grammatical works. In this *Trial Version*, only the entries under ALCUIN and PRISCIAN have been included S.N.]

The evidence for the use of Latin grammars in Anglo-Saxon England falls into two distinct periods: an earlier one, coinciding with the first flowering of Anglo-Latin literature around 700, and a later one which commences with the Benedictine reform movement and covers the latter part of the tenth and the eleventh centuries. In the earlier period our chief source of information is the writings of Anglo-Latin teachers—ALDHELM, TATWINE, BONIFACE, and BEDE. In the later period the evidence is more varied, including manuscripts and booklists as well as grammars by Anglo-Saxon authors. For the intervening period, extending from the second third of the eighth century to the opening of the tenth, source material is scarce. ALCUIN'S writings are an uncertain guide, for they may well have been compiled on the Continent (as his *DIALOGUS FRANCONIS ET SAXONIS DE OCTO PARTIBUS ORATIONIS* almost certainly was), and are more likely to reflect

the resources of Frankish rather than those of Anglo-Saxon libraries. (ABBO OF FLEURY'S *QUAESTIONES GRAMMATICAE* raise similar difficulties, for Abbo spent only two years at Ramsey, and his replies to the questions put him by the monks are likely to depend upon knowledge he acquired at home. Or are we to imagine that he walked into the library at Ramsey and looked up answers to the questions in books the monks could have consulted for themselves?) It is to be hoped that work on the *fontes* of Anglo-Latin works from this period on subjects other than grammar will help to fill in this gap.

The following discussion surveys the distribution of works dealing with grammar narrowly defined, i.e. with the eight parts of speech. It does not take into account texts on metrics, orthography, or rhetoric.

The introduction of Christianity brought with it the need to learn Latin, the language of the Church. Although the grammars written under the later Roman Empire were themselves diverse and varied, they provided nothing directly designed to help beginners master Latin morphology, a lacuna which medieval teachers filled in many ways. Only a few grammars were widely available in Anglo-Saxon England during the earlier period: DONATUS' *ARS MINOR* and *ARS MAIOR*, PRISCIAN'S *INSTITUTIO DE NOMINE*, and the first book of ISIDORE'S *ETYMOLOGIAE*. Various combinations of works by the following authors could be found at individual centers: ASPER/ASPORIOS, AUDAX, CHARISIUS, CONSENTIUS, DIOMEDES, EUTYCHES, MARTIANUS CAPELLA (Book III), PHOCAS, POMPEIUS, PRISCIAN'S *INSTITUTIONES GRAMMATICAE* and *PARTITIONES*, SERGIUS (PS CASSIODORUS), SERGIUS (DE LITTERA), VICTORINUS, VIRGILIUS MARO GRAMMATICUS, the ANONYMUS BOBIENSIS, and a lost grammar ascribed to JEROME. To provide a more straightforward introduction to Latin declension and conjugation, Anglo-Saxon teachers made use of compilations of noun and verb paradigms accompanied by copious lists of examples (*Declinationes nominum*) and composed their own introductory grammars (Tatwine, Boniface). Taken to the Continent during the eighth century, these works and most of the ancient grammars studied by the Anglo-Saxons enjoyed a brief vogue until a few decades into the ninth century. The Carolingian renaissance brought with it a change in grammatical and pedagogical fashion. Of the ancient texts, those which were based on material similar to Donatus' grammars, the so-called *Schulgrammatik* genre—Audax, Charisius, Consentius, Diomedes, Victorinus, *Anonymus Bobiensis*—dropped out of favor, as did the commentaries by Pompeius and Sergius (Ps Cassiodorus), along with early medieval attempts at providing instructional material better suited to beginners (Asper/Asporius, *Declinationes nominum*, the elementary grammars). Grammars of *regulae* type (that is, works which set out rules for the identification of particular grammatical forms) like those by Phocas and Eutyches, pseudo-Palaemon and pseudo-Augustine, retained or increased their popularity. But the biggest change

was the dissemination of several works by Priscian which had not previously been widely available, notably the *Institutiones grammaticae* and the *Partitiones*. Much pedagogical activity from the ninth century on was devoted to the problem of making the doctrine of the *Institutiones* accessible, whether by explicit comparison between it and Donatus, or by incorporating material from it into commentaries on Donatus, or by preparing abridged versions. At a lower level a new genre, the parsing grammar, permitted the teacher greater flexibility, whilst the commentaries by SMARAGDUS, the *Scotti peregrini*, and REMIGIUS OF AUXERRE elucidated the text of currently fashionable grammarians – Donatus, Eutyches, Priscian. The evidence from tenth- and eleventh-century England corresponds closely to the Continental pattern, implying that English grammatical instruction was heavily influenced by imports from the Continent in the wake of the Benedictine reform movement. Parsing grammars and abridgements of Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae* (as well as the real thing) are well attested, along with works by Donatus, Eutyches, and Remigius. ÆLFRIC's grammar breaks with the Carolingian tradition, substituting a textbook in the vernacular for the Latin-medium intermediate grammars in circulation previously.

The reader should note the following outstanding problems and warnings:

(a) Several texts preserved in English MSS (*Anonymus ad Cuimnanum* [edition in preparation by B. Bischoff], *Anima quae pars*, *Iustus quae pars*) or mentioned in an English booklist (*Terra quae pars*) have not yet been definitively localized, nor have their sources been studied. Data from them is not included in these entries. Note also that only a little information from Alcuin's grammars and *Beatus quid est* has been included at this stage, and none at all from the *Quaestiones grammaticales* of Abbo of Fleury.

(b) Given that every Anglo-Latin writer had by definition a training in Latin grammar, it is very likely that grammarians are mentioned or quoted in texts on subjects other than grammar. I have not attempted to locate such passages, but would be glad to receive notification of them, and/or to help in their identification. Evidence of this kind is needed most urgently for the period between roughly 750 and 950, for which direct sources are few.

(c) As stated above, I have tried to cover only those ancient works which deal with the parts of speech. In the case of most authors this is unproblematical; with Bede, however, difficulties have arisen. He used a large number of sources, including not only the ancient *grammatici*, but also *metrici*, *orthographici*, *rhetorici*, and glossaries. Without checking all these possible sources one cannot always ascertain whether a grammarian rather than a writer

on rhetoric, say, was the source for a particular passage. Consequently, my policy has for practical reasons been as follows: in the *De orthographia* I have checked all the passages attributed to the grammarians (and checked them against other possible sources, except for glossaries); thus, where BEDA.Orthogr. is included under Quots/Cits in the entry for a particular grammarian, this means that that grammarian was in my opinion known to Bede. Where reference to BEDA.Orthogr. is lacking, this means that (again in my judgment) that grammarian was not used by Bede. (Thus, the absence of this entry under Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae* is not accidental.) I have not, however, attempted to draw up entries for sources used by Bede other than the *grammatici* narrowly defined. In the case of *De schematibus et tropis*, except for a few obvious cases it seemed best to leave this text to a specialist in metrics.

For further discussion, see Holtz (1981), Law (1982), Law (1983), Law (1985), Law (1986), and Law (1987).

V. Law

HIBERNO-LATIN AND IRISH-INFLUENCED BIBLICAL COMMENTARIES, FLORILEGIA, AND HOMILY COLLECTIONS

Under this heading are grouped three kinds of texts. The first group includes the mostly anonymous or pseudonymous biblical commentaries identified by Bischoff (1976) as Irish or Irish-influenced. Certain major Hiberno-Latin exegetes, notably JOHN SCOTTUS ERIUGENA and SEDULIUS SCOTTUS, are not included here but will be found as separate entries under each author's name. Several commentaries not in Bischoff's list are included: one (number 13) was too late for Bischoff's ninth-century limit; and several others (numbers 2, *3, *5, *14, 15, *27, *28, *33, *37) have been identified by other scholars as possibly Irish in origin. Two items which are mostly in Irish (numbers 12 and 23) are included for reasons explained in each entry.

The second group includes a number of anonymous catechetical dialogues and florilegia of biblical and moral extracts that have been identified by Bischoff and other scholars as Hiberno-Latin or Irish-influenced. Penitential and canonical collections, such as the POENITENTIALE CUMMEANI, the COLLECTIO CANONUM HIBERNENSIS, and the LIBER EX LEGE MOYSI, are not included here. Nor are such unified ethical or theological treatises such